

2001 Current Fiscal Year Report: Reactor Oversight Process Initial Implementation Evaluation Panel

Report Run Date: 06/06/2019 03:35:43 AM

1. Department or Agency

Nuclear Regulatory Commission

2. Fiscal Year

2001

3. Committee or Subcommittee

Reactor Oversight Process Initial Implementation Evaluation Panel

3b. GSA Committee No.

9533

4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?

Yes

5. Current Charter

10/17/2000

6. Expected Renewal Date

7. Expected Term Date

07/31/2001

8a. Was Terminated During Fiscal Year?

Yes

8b. Specific Termination Authority

8c. Actual Term Date

07/31/2001

9. Agency Recommendation for Next Fiscal Year

Terminate

10a. Legislation Req to Terminate?

No

10b. Legislation Pending?

11. Establishment Authority

12. Specific Establishment Authority

42 USC 2201

Agency Authority

13. Effective Date

07/01/1958

14. Committee Type

Ad hoc

14c. Presidential?

No

15. Description of Committee

16a. Total Number of Reports

16b. Report Date

05/10/2001

Report Title

Final Report - Reactor Oversight Process Initial Implementation Evaluation Panel

1

Number of Committee Reports Listed: 1

17a. Open 6 17b. Closed 0 17c. Partially Closed 0 Other Activities 0 17d. Total 6

Meetings and Dates

Purpose	Start	End
Discuss Performance Measures for Reactor Oversight Process	11/01/2000	11/02/2000
Review Results of Reactor Oversight Process	12/11/2000	12/12/2000
Review of Reactor Oversight Process	01/22/2001	01/23/2001
Prioritization of Issues Identified by Oversight Panel	02/26/2001	02/27/2001
Review of Reactor Oversight Process - Self-Assessment Program and Lessons Learned Workshops	04/02/2001	04/03/2001
Review Draft Report and Finalize Recommendations	04/25/2001	04/25/2001

Number of Committee Meetings Listed: 6

Current FY Next FY

18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members

\$0.00 \$0.00

18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members	\$119,067.00	\$0.00
18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff	\$39,683.00	\$0.00
18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members	\$19,016.00	\$0.00
18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members	\$29,420.00	\$0.00
18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff	\$1,751.00	\$0.00
18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18c. Other(rents,user charges, graphics, printing, mail, etc.)	\$5,000.00	\$0.00
18d. Total	\$213,937.00	\$0.00
19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)	0.40	0.00

20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?

The IIEP worked as a management-level cross-disciplinary oversight group of experts to evaluate whether the NRC's new reactor regulatory oversight process was effectively carried out and whether it was achieving its overall objectives. The panel solicited and obtained additional views, to supplement the members' personal insights, from representatives of four States (New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Vermont), the Union of Concerned Scientists, the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI), NRC resident inspectors, NRC senior reactor analysts, the NRC Office of Public Affairs, and McGraw-Hill. The NRC staff members directly involved in the process development reported on the status of the initial implementation and responded to questions and comments. The IIEP concluded that the revised Reactor Oversight Process was a notable improvement over the previous licensee performance assessment program and should be continued. The reactor oversight process made progress toward achieving the Agency's four performance goals: 1) maintain safety, 2) increase public confidence, 3) increase regulatory effectiveness and efficiency, and 4) reduce unnecessary regulatory burden. In addition, the process provides a more objective, risk-informed, predictable, and understandable approach to the oversight of commercial nuclear reactor facilities.

20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?

Committee membership included NRC regional and headquarters staff, representatives from the Nuclear Energy Institute, licensee management, public interest groups, and state regulatory agencies.

20c. How frequent and relevant are the Committee Meetings?

The Committee met 6 times and produced a final report on May 10, 2001.

20d. Why can't the advice or information this committee provides be obtained elsewhere?

The Committee provided the NRC with the opportunity to get broad input and evaluation of its new reactor oversight process during the initial year of its implementation so that valuable feedback could be factored into the program and revisions made at an early stage.

20e. Why is it necessary to close and/or partially closed committee meetings?

No closed meetings were held.

21. Remarks

Committee Terminated 7/31/2001

Designated Federal Officer

John D Monninger

Committee Members	Start	End	Occupation	Member Designation
Blough, A	11/01/2000	07/31/2001	U S Nuclear Regulatory Commission	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Borchardt, R	11/01/2000	04/02/2001	U S Nuclear Regulatory Commission	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Brockman, Kenneth	11/01/2000	07/31/2001	U S Nuclear Regulatory Commission	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Ferdig, Mary	12/04/2000	07/31/2001	Ferdig Inc. Organizational Research and Development	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Floyd, Steve	11/01/2000	07/31/2001	Nuclear Energy Institute	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Garchow, David	11/01/2000	07/31/2001	PSEG Nuclear LLC	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Hill, Richard	11/01/2000	07/31/2001	Southern Nuclear Operating Company	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Krich, Rod	11/01/2000	07/31/2001	Commonwealth Edison Company	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Laurie, Robert	11/01/2000	07/31/2001	California Energy Commission	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Lochbaum, David	11/01/2000	11/06/2000	Union Of Concerned Scientists	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Moorman, James	11/01/2000	07/31/2001	U S Nuclear Regulatory Commission	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Plisco, Loren	11/01/2000	07/31/2001	U S Nuclear Regulatory Commission	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Reynolds, Steven	11/01/2000	07/31/2001	U S Nuclear Regulatory Commission	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Scherer, A	11/01/2000	07/31/2001	Southern California Edison Company	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Setser, James	11/01/2000	07/31/2001	Georgia Department Of Natural Resources	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Shadis, Raymond	12/04/2000	07/31/2001	New England Coalition On Nuclear Pollution	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Trapp, James	11/01/2000	07/31/2001	U S Nuclear Regulatory Commission	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member

Number of Committee Members Listed: 17

Narrative Description

What are the most significant program outcomes associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

- | | |
|---|--------------------------|
| Improvements to health or safety | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Trust in government | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Major policy changes | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Advance in scientific research | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Effective grant making | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Improved service delivery | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Increased customer satisfaction | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Implementation of laws or regulatory requirements | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Outcome Comments

What are the cost savings associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

- | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| None | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Unable to Determine | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Under \$100,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| \$100,000 - \$500,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| \$500,001 - \$1,000,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| \$1,000,001 - \$5,000,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| \$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Over \$10,000,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Cost Savings Other | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Cost Savings Comments

What is the approximate Number of recommendations produced by this committee for the life of the committee?

0

Number of Recommendations Comments

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Fully implemented by the agency?

0%

% of Recommendations Fully Implemented Comments

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Partially implemented by the agency?

0%

% of Recommendations Partially Implemented Comments

Does the agency provide the committee with feedback regarding actions taken to implement recommendations or advice offered?

Yes ☐ No ☐ Not Applicable ☒

Agency Feedback Comments

What other actions has the agency taken as a result of the committee's advice or recommendation?

Checked if Applies

Reorganized Priorities	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reallocated resources	<input type="checkbox"/>
Issued new regulation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Proposed legislation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Approved grants or other payments	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Action Comments

Is the Committee engaged in the review of applications for grants?

No

Grant Review Comments

How is access provided to the information for the Committee's documentation?

Checked if Applies

- | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| Contact DFO | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Online Agency Web Site | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Online Committee Web Site | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Online GSA FACA Web Site | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Publications | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Access Comments